

REMARKS

In the aforementioned Office communication, the examiner indicated in the summary of the Office action that claims 1, and 4-8 were pending in the application and were all rejected. In fact, claim 5 was previously canceled. It was further noted that no claims had been withdrawn. In the examiner's comments, however, the examiner specifically noted a rejection of claims 4-8 under Section 112, but in explaining the rejection referenced claim 1. The reference to claim 1 is felt to have been a typographical error as the phraseology referenced occurs only in claim 4. Accordingly, the phraseology in claim 4 has been amended to overcome the Section 112 rejection and, accordingly, it is felt each of claims 4 and 6-8 is now in allowable form. Per the examiner's comments in paragraph 2 of his Office action, this should place the application in condition for allowance.

It is not clear, however, whether or not claim 1 has been allowed as the examiner did not mention claim 1 in his comments but indicated in the summary of the office action that it was rejected. Accordingly, it is assumed the subject matter thereof is acceptable and it being believed there are no specific rejections of claim 1 under Section 112, it should be in allowable form.

While claim 1 was originally withdrawn due to an earlier restriction requirement, that restriction requirement was vacated per the present Office action.

Accordingly, it is assumed each of claims 1, 4, and 6-8 remaining in the application is in allowable form, and there being no other rejections or objections of the application, it is felt it is now in condition for allowance and such action is courteously requested.

Dated: June 7, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary M. Pdlumbus, Reg. No. 25,364
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
370 Seventeenth Street, Suite 4700
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Tel: 303-629-3400
Fax: 303-629-3450

USPTO Customer No.: 20686